

**MINUTES**  
**SANDY CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

Sandy City Hall - Council Chamber Room #211  
10000 Centennial Parkway  
Sandy, Utah 84070

**JULY 18, 2006**

Meeting was commenced at 7:04 p.m.

**PRESENT:**

**Council Members:** Chairman, Vice Chairman Linda Martinez Saville, Steve Fairbanks, Bryant Anderson, Scott Cowdell, Steve Fairbanks Chris McCandless, and Dennis Tenney

**Mayor:** Tom Dolan

**Others in Attendance:** City Attorney Walter Miller; Community Development Director Mike Coulam; Planning Director George Shaw; Assistant CAO James Davidson; Management Analyst Korban Lee; Deputy to the Mayor John Hiskey; Police Chief Stephen Chapman; Sandy Chamber Director Nancy Workman; Council Office Director Phil Glenn; Council Office Manager Naleen Wright

**ABSENT/EXCUSED:**

Councilman Stephen Smith (excused/FEMA training); CAO Byron Jorgenson

1. **OPENING REMARKS/PRAYER/PLEDGE:**

The Prayer was offered by Councilman Dennis Tenney, and the Pledge was led by Councilman Bryant Anderson.

2. **SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS:**

A) **Police Officer Brent Webb/ Acknowledgment of Exceptional Work:**

Council Chairwoman Linda Martinez Saville, Mayor Tom Dolan and Police Chief Steve Chapman presented **Police Officer Brent Webb** with a gift certificate for his police traffic work, and specifically, for his work in the Drivers' Awareness Class. The Chief read a letter from a Sandy resident, Sharon Baker, who attended one of his classes (not the first such letter received), wherein she actually thanked Officer Webb for the education that she obtained at a class which she was not, at first, happy to attend. This resident claimed that Officer Webb took a class of over 100 pretty angry and upset people, and with humor, reversed the tense atmosphere into one where people learned what was being taught. This resident claimed that people left the class with a better understanding of safe driving and an appreciation for the hard work Police Officers do every day.

B) **Councilman Scott Cowdell**

Council Chairwoman Linda Martinez Saville presented **Councilman Scott Cowdell** with a framed newspaper article from the ***Salt Lake Tribune***. Mrs. Saville explained that **Scott Cowdell** complains quite frequently how the press misquotes him or misunderstand his statements when they appear in print in the local papers. This ***Tribune*** article, was in Mr. Cowdell's words, "perfectly, and accurately written." The article was written in honor of Mr. Cowdell's service to the Jordan School District, his integrity, his work ethic and his recent retirement. It related information about his great relationship and love for his family. **Linda Saville** said, "Oft times, people forget that people serving on a city council also work at a full-time job, have families, and still have time to be concerned with the issues of Sandy residents."

3. **CITIZEN(S) COMMENTS:**

- a. **Maria Wright**, 2640 East Snow Mountain Drive, complained that she did not understand the methodology used to compute her monthly water bill. She asked if Sandy had a program designed for people who exist on a limited income.

**Assistant CAO James Davidson** explained that the charges on the Mrs. Wright's water bill include water usage, and fixed costs involved with the water system itself. He directed Ms. Wright to speak with **Art Hunter** concerning Salt Lake County's "Circuit Breaker" program for those on limited fixed incomes.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING(S):**

4. **Silver Sage Rezone and Code Amendment**

**Public Hearing to consider a request submitted by Kerry Jorgensen and Marvin Hendrickson to rezone approximately 2.43 acres from the PO "Professional Office District" to the "SD/PO Silver Sage District". The property is located at approximately 10883 South 700 East. In addition, the City Council will consider a city initiated Code Amendment to the following: Section 15-04-02(B), Table of Minimum Building Setbacks, and Section 15-07-02(E), Landscaping Adjacent to Residential Districts-Title 15, Land Development Code, Revised Ordinances of Sandy City. The proposed ordinance amendments will be city-wide; however, they may also affect the previously mentioned property. A Public Hearing was also held 6-27-06 and continued until this evening.**

**DISCUSSION:** **Planning Director George Shaw** reported that this public hearing, held before the City Council, was continued from 6-27-06. Notification of this second hearing was provided both in the newspaper and by flyers.

**Developer Kerry Jorgensen** asked if the Council would be dealing with the rezoning first, or the code amendment. He stated that if the code amendment were to be done first and approved, he would withdraw his rezoning request.

**The Council determined that as both issues pertain to the developer's request, the hearing would proceed as noticed; the rezoning first, and then the code amendment.**

**Kerry Jorgensen** reported that he started the process to get approvals for his professional office project over a year ago with the Planning Commission. This property is a very difficult parcel to develop, because it is as narrow as 85 feet at the north end, and less than 90 feet deep most of the width of the property. As part of his development plan for this uniquely shaped property, and because an approximate 50 foot canal corridor separates his property from the existing residential development, Mr. Jorgensen is requesting a reduced rear setback and a reduction in the rear landscaping requirement. The applicant has proposed a 20 foot rear setback variance (current code requires 30 feet) from the property line. He is also seeking a reduced buffer landscape variance to 5 feet. (Current code requires 10 feet.)

According to Mr. Jorgensen, the problem with the 30-foot setback being required for both the front and the rear of the property, would be that only a 24 foot wide building could be constructed. This is less than a double-wide trailer. Mr. Jorgensen reported that all building materials will be similar to those used in the high-end properties located to the east of the subject development. The Planning Commission approved the project subject to two variances being approved by the Board of Adjustment (BOA).

The two variances involved are:

- 1) Sandy City Development Code Section 15-04-02 (B) "Table of Minimum Building Setbacks."
- 2) Sandy City Development Code Section 15-07-02(E) "Commercial Landscaping Requirements."

The BOA reviewed the proposed variances on April 13, 2006, and Mr. Jorgensen reported that they sent the decision back to the City Council. They advised him (Mr. Jorgensen) that they were not planners, and therefore, they felt they should not decide whether the project was to be one-story or two-story. As a result of this meeting, Mr. Jorgensen stated that he scaled the office buildings down from two-story to one-story. It is believed that this will be a better design and provide the lowest impact on the neighborhood. The one-story option was the option most preferred by the neighbors.

Mr. Jorgensen noted that without the proposed rezoning, and if he utilized the existing PO Zone, he could get 22% more building space. But, with the approval of the rezoning and his revised plan, he could build a better building that would blend more nicely with the neighborhood. He asked to be allowed to develop this property in the most attractive and functional way.

The Public Hearing was opened.

- A. **Jim Harding**, Berrywood Court, stated that as he lives directly across the street from the proposed project, he would prefer a one-story development. He was concerned that a two-story building would block his view of Lone Peak Mountain.
- B. **Travis Scott**, Sandy Dunes Drive, stated that he was not opposed to the development, but he had concerns with the size and standards of the overall project. He reported that Mr. Jorgensen told the neighborhood that if he was unable to receive the extra space afforded to him through an SD Zone change, he would have to build two-story buildings. Under the existing PO Zone, no building can exceed the 25 foot building height. He was concerned that the developer appears to be seeking approvals for a larger project at the expense of precious open space.
- C. **Holly Kirby**, 10822 Berrywood Court, stated that she would prefer the one-story option. It was her desire to retain a community feeling in this area.
- D. **Roy Reynolds**, 10922 Savannah Drive, said he wasn't concerned with the height of the building as much as the parking of patrons so close to his home.
- E. -----, Dusty Creek, stated that he favors the proposed project and the plan proposed. Sandy is a beautiful city with plenty of large open spaces. His main concern was that the trail access would be located so close to the commercial buildings. He supported the 30-foot setback.
- F. **Elaine Workman**, Savannah Drive, reported that she had previously presented a petition containing 60 signatures. She was resubmitting a new petition to re-establish the validity of the residents' concerns. The residents who have signed the petition all agree that Mr. Jorgensen should be required to maintain the 30 foot setback, as has been required of all other businesses in the area. Residents are not opposed to the Professional Office buildings, but feel strongly that the developer should not be able to construct buildings so large that he cannot maintain the 30 foot setback.
- G. **Merrilee Scott**, 10880 Savannah Drive, stated that she did not believe that Mr. Jorgensen's property met the conditions to qualify for an SD Zone. According to the criteria she had, the parcel had to be a minimum of 4 acres in size to qualify, and Mr. Jorgensen's is only 2.43 acres. (Later in the meeting it was clarified that the 4 acre requirement had been amended in 2002 to a two acre size.) She stated that the Board of Adjustment (BOA) denied the developer's request for two variances, stating that literal enforcement of the current ordinance would not impose undue hardship on the developer. Ms. Scott felt rezoning the property to the SD Zone was a way to "go through the back door" to go around the BOA's ruling.
- H. **Mark Scott**, 10880 Savannah Drive, thanked the Council for this opportunity to address them. He provided photographs to show the Council how this development will be built 10 feet from open space areas. He asked, "Is this what we want located 10 feet away from our open space and parks?" Mr. Scott felt the proposed project would "box in our trail system and make it appear like an alley." He did not believe the burden of proof had been met showing that an SD Zone was needed for this development. He advised the Council that the BOA asked all parties affected by this development request meet together to draw up a compromise. He suggested the following compromise: setting the rear and side setbacks at 20 feet if adjacent to open space. The building must be a single-story building with the appropriate landscape buffer provided. Residents would benefit from a single-story development with a larger setback than what has been proposed.
- I. **Wayne Johnson**, Savannah Drive, stated that he has lived in Sandy for 29 years. He would like the development proposal to remain the way it is. He noted that under the current PO Zone, the allowable building height for a two-story building is 25 feet, and a one-story building can be up to 22 feet. He felt the 30 foot setback should remain in place. Mr. Johnson asked, "If you adopt the proposed code amendment, couldn't it be a bad amendment when it is imposed on the entire City?"

**The public hearing was closed by the Chairwoman.**

**Council Discussion:**

**Scott Cowdell** commented that he has not seen anything that would compel him to support a zone change. He stated that he supports the ruling of the BOA. Mr. Cowdell said that he would make a motion to table the code amendment, until an inventory of all properties that may be affected by the proposed code amendment can be presented to the Council. Development should not encroach on the neighborhood to the east, even when there is a canal corridor that separates the existing residential development from the proposed development.

**Chris McCandless** asked Mr. Jorgensen to clarify the building heights; one-story vs. two-story.

**Mr. Jorgensen** explained that a one-story building can be up to 22 feet high, while a two-story building is limited to 25 feet.

**Chris McCandless** stated that he was not necessarily in favor of the proposed rezoning. He liked the 20 foot setback, and would like to see the buildings remain single-story buildings built under the storefront conservation concept. In his opinion, the 50 foot canal open space area is passive rather than active, so he was agreeable to the 20 foot setback.

**Mike Coulam** suggested that definitions for passive and active could be added to the definitions section.

**Dennis Tenney** asked Mr. Jorgensen if he could abide by the proposed compromise suggested by Mark Scott; 20 foot rear and side setbacks, single-story and appropriate buffer landscaping.

**Mr. Jorgensen** responded, "If I drop 23% of the building's space, I would go into the red. He stated that he had went over this with Mr. Scott previously. While ten feet does not sound like much, a 20% building reduction would mean long thin buildings that would be hard to market.

**Dennis Tenney** asked Mr. Jorgensen if the Council were to approve the code amendment and the proposed zone change, would he be willing to do landscape along the east side of the property.

**Mr. Jorgensen** indicated that a landscaping plan was included with his proposal. The approved landscaping plan (already approved by the Planning Commission) shows a 10 foot landscaped corridor, not a 30 foot one.

**Dennis Tenney** commented that he wished he had 50 feet of open space behind his home. A reduction to a 30 foot rear setback down to 15 feet and including 10 feet of a landscaped buffer area would still give the residential area more than a 60 foot buffer (this didn't include the depth of the residents backyards). He stated that he was comfortable with the proposed zone change. Mr. Tenney liked Mr. Cowdell's idea to inventory properties affected by the code amendment before its adoption is considered. He noted that Mr. Jorgensen could build a two-story building under the current zone.

**Bryant Anderson** asked **Mike Coulam** if the SD Zone can accommodate different setbacks, without adoption of the code amendment. He also asked if a trail was in the plan along the canal corridor.

**Mike Coulam** responded, "Yes, the SD Zone can be designed with different setbacks." Our Trails Master Plan shows a trail within the canal's 50 foot right-of-way.

**Bryant Anderson** noted that this property is unusual as it is quite narrow, which will make it difficult to build upon. He agreed that the code amendment should not be approved until we see what other City properties could be affected. Mr. Anderson stated that he would like to see a one-story residential looking building. He was, however, concerned with the windows located on the back side of the buildings. Two story windows could cause a loss of privacy for the neighborhood. A one-story building would be more appropriate for the residential area to the rear of the proposed development. He liked the quality of the product being proposed with brick, windows, and gables. He felt the design and materials were very nice.

**Steve Fairbanks** commented that he went to look over this piece of property, just the other day. He stated that he quite frankly could not see what the neighborhood thought they were giving up when they claim the land behind their homes is lush open space. There are many unsightly weeds and litter, and this project would vastly improve the property. He asked **Mike Coulam** if he would verify whether this parcel qualifies for the SD Zone, as it is smaller than the 4 acre minimum.

**Mike Coulam** stated that the code was changed on this issue. It presently states that there must be a minimum of two acres to be considered for an SD (Special Development) Zone. Mr. Coulam noted that Staff is working on a re-write of the Development Code, and this issue will be discussed further.

**Mr. Fairbanks** commented that a 10 foot landscaping buffer would be a vast improvement over the weeds.

**Linda Martinez Saville** stated that she continues to support the residents and is opposed to the rezoning and code amendment.

**#1**

**MOTION:** Scott Cowdell made the motion to **TABLE** the proposed code amendment until Staff can prepare an inventory of all properties in the City that would be affected by the amendment, and present those findings to the Council.

**SECOND:** Steve Fairbanks

**VOTE: (#1)** Cowdell- Yes, Fairbanks- Yes, Tenney- Yes, Smith- Absent, McCandless- Yes, Anderson- Yes, Saville- Yes

**MOTION PASSED**  
6 in favor, 1 absent

**#2**

**MOTION:** Scott Cowdell made the motion to **DENY** the proposed zone change, because he did not feel there were any compelling reasons presented that warranted a change.

**SECOND:** Linda Martinez Saville

**Discussion on the motion:**

Dennis Tenney asked if Legal Staff would address the potential impacts of the proposed zone change with regard to other properties throughout the City, as compared to enacting this zone for this particular parcel. It was his understanding that this was an SD (Special Development) Zone that would affect just this specific parcel. He asked if enacting the proposed zone change would impact other properties in the City too.

Mike Coulam responded, "The proposed zone change will just affect this particular property." Mr. Coulam also commented that the size of a piece of property qualifying for an SD Zone Classification was reduced to 2 acres, where previously it had been 4. (Adopted 2002)

Dennis Tenney stated that as has been explained by Mr. Coulam, that the proposed zone change will only affect this property, he would be voting against the motion to deny the rezoning.

Phil Glenn pointed out that if the vote ended up in a tie vote, because there are only six Council members present, it would effectively kill any further consideration of this issue. He thought the Council may want to delay their decision until a full Council was available for the vote.

**#3**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

**MOTION:** Dennis Tenney stated that in fairness to the applicant, that we **DELAY** the vote until three weeks from tonight, on this specific zone, when we will have all seven Council members present.

**MOTION DIES FOR LACK OF A SECOND**

**VOTE: (#2)** Cowdell- Yes, Saville- Yes, Tenney- No, Smith- Absent, McCandless- No, Anderson- No, Fairbanks- No

**MOTION FAILED**  
2 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 absent

**#4**

**MOTION:** Dennis Tenney stated that in view of the fact that the proposed rezoning only affects this particular property, his motion would be to have documents brought back to APPROVE the rezoning of approximately 2.43 acres, located at approximately 10883 South 700 East, from the PO "Professional Office District" to the SD/PO Silver Sage District" as recommended by the Planning Commission and the Planning Department (with their additional conditions).

**\*\*ADDED TO THE ORIGINAL MOTION (see discussion below)**

To "require" a 15 foot rear setback and to "encourage" the developer to utilize storefront conservation positioning, already allowed within the zone, so the developer can bring the building closer to 700 East (by 5 feet), thereby reducing the front setback.

**SECOND:** Bryant Anderson

Question on the motion:

Steve Fairbanks asked if the zone change would include the revised 10 foot rear buffer requirement.

Dennis Tenney responded, "Yes." The canal's 50 foot corridor will provide sufficient room for a trail.

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:** Scott Cowdell made the motion ..... (See below)

Chris McCandless said, "Scott, before you do that, can I ask for clarification on the first motion?"

Scott Cowdell responded, "Sure."

Chris McCandless asked Mike Coulam if this specific SD Zone were to remain on the property, could the developer develop the one-story buildings designed and presented tonight?

Mike Coulam responded, "Yes."

Chris McCandless asked if we decided to change the setback and encourage the storefront conservation element in our motion, in this zoning change, and require a 15 foot setback instead of 10, would that be appropriate as part of this friendly amendment to the motion?

Mike Coulam responded, "Yes, it is whatever you direct us to include as conditions on the SD Zone."

Chris McCandless asked does the zone we have presently in place encourage storefront conservation development in order to be able to reduce the front setback?

Mike Coulam responded, "It is the developer's choice."

Chris McCandless asked, "Can we make a friendly amendment to the motion that would "require" a 15 foot rear setback, and to "encourage" the developer to utilize storefront conservation positioning, allowed in that zone, to bring the building closer to 700 East by 5 feet to reduce the front setback?

Phil Glenn asked that the Council clarify whether Mr. McCandless' motion amendment is an "additional alternative" or a "replacement" only motion.

Mr. Tenney & Mr. McCandless said it was a "replacement," not an additional "alternative."

**\*\*Dennis Tenney stated that he would accept the two setback amendments as proposed by Mr. McCandless, and asked that they be added to his original motion.**

Chris McCandless further clarified that a 15 foot rear setback would be "required." The developer would be "encouraged" to apply the storefront positioning found within the zone to bring the front of his building closer to 700 East by 5 feet, thus reducing the front setback.

**#5**

**SUBSTITUTE MOTION:**

**MOTION:** Scott Cowdell made the motion that we deny the 10 foot setback and impose a 20 foot rear setback on the development.

**SECOND:** Linda Martinez Saville

**Question on the motion:**

Dennis Tenney is this to approve the current SD zone with a 20 foot rear setback?

Scott Cowdell, "Yes."

Dennis Tenney responded, "Then under the Council's rules, I will explain that I will be voting "No" on the substitute motion. I don't think 20 foot is reasonable. I feel that a 15 foot rear setback and reducing the front setback by 5 feet is reasonable.

**VOTE (#5):** Cowdell- Yes, Saville- Yes, Anderson- No, Fairbanks- No,  
Smith- Absent, McCandless- No, Tenney-No

**MOTION FAILED**

2 in favor, 4 opposed and 1 absent

Phil Glenn asked the Council if they would like to get input from the developer as to whether he would accept the new zone, before a vote is taken.

Dennis Tenney asked Mr. Jorgensen, "Mr. Jorgensen, if we impose this new zone, are you willing to accept it?"

Mr. Jorgensen responded, "Very honestly, I am just uncertain. The thing is, I guess you understood, I'm already utilizing the suburban piece of the storefront development easement. What you are suggesting is that I drop to the urban one, which would require me to put my building very close to a very busy highway on 700 East. I just don't know."

Linda Martinez Saville said, "Let's go ahead with the vote Mr. Jorgensen."

**(Motion #4)**

**VOTE:** Tenney- Yes, Anderson- Yes, Smith- Absent, McCandless- Yes,  
Cowdell- No, Fairbanks- Yes, Saville- No

**MOTION PASSED**

4 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 absent

**5. Boys & Girls Club Assistance**

Public Hearing to consider authorizing Sandy City to provide assistance to the Boys and Girls Clubs of South Valley, a nonprofit corporation, in the form of (1) Conveyance of bicycles which have been forfeited to and/or declared surplus by the City; and (2) Use of portions of the building at 440 East 8680 South in Sandy for Club activities. A study setting forth an analysis of this proposal is available to the Public in the City Recorder's Office, Suite 311, Sandy City Hall, during regular business hours.

**DISCUSSION:** **Linda Martinez Saville** stated that she would step aside and abstain from the vote and discussion on this issue. She disclosed that she is the Director of the Sandy Boys & Girls Club.

**City Attorney Walter Miller** explained that Linda Martinez Saville is being extra cautious by removing herself, but legally she did not have to.

**Korban Lee** explained the study that was conducted to determine the value of what is given to the Boys & Girls Club by the City versus the value of what is given back to the City by services rendered by the Boys & Girls Club. The study conclusively showed that the City receives more value in return from the Club than the expense to the City.

**MOTION:** **Scott Cowdell** made the motion that documents be prepared to adopt a formalized policy for: (1) Conveyance of bicycles which have been forfeited to and/or declared surplus by the City; and (2) Use of portions of the building at 440 East 8680 South in Sandy for Boys & Girls Club activities.

**SECOND:** **Chris McCandless**

**VOTE:** Cowdell- Yes, McCandless- Yes, Tenney- Yes, Smith- Absent  
Anderson- Yes, Fairbanks- Yes, Saville- Abstained

**MOTION PASSED**

5 in favor, 1 absent, 1 abstained

#### **COUNCIL ITEMS:**

6. **Interlocal Agreement: UDOT/Sandy "Two Bridges Project"**  
**Resolution #06-54 C - authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Sandy City to provide for the property acquisition for the "Two Bridges Project" located at 8710 South 50 West and 8800 South 200 East.**

**MOTION:** **Steve Fairbanks** made the motion to adopt Resolution #06-54 C - authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Sandy City to provide for the property acquisition for the "Two Bridges Project" located at 8710 South 50 West and 8800 South 200 East.

**SECOND:** **Dennis Tenney**

**VOTE:** Fairbanks- Yes, Tenney- Yes, Smith- Absent, McCandless- Yes,  
Anderson- Yes, Cowdell- Yes, Saville- Yes

**MOTION PASSED**

6 in favor, 1 absent

7. **Code Amendment: Section 15-10-04 & 15-10-06 (Allowed Signs and Prohibited Signage)**  
**Ordinance #06-22 - amending Title 15 of the Revised Ordinances of Sandy City (The Land Development Code) by amending Section 15-10-04, "Prohibited Sign Devices", Section 15-10-06, "Signs Allowed Without a Permit", and Section 15-15, "Definitions"; also providing a saving clause and effective date for the ordinance.**

**MOTION:** **Dennis Tenney** made the motion to adopt Ordinance #06-22 - amending Title 15 of the Revised Ordinances of Sandy City (The Land Development Code) by amending Section 15-10-04, "Prohibited Sign Devices", Section 15-10-06, "Signs Allowed Without a Permit", and Section 15-15, "Definitions"; also providing a saving clause and effective date for the ordinance.

**SECOND:** **Chris McCandless**

**VOTE:** Tenney- Yes, McCandless- Yes, Smith- Absent,  
Anderson- Yes, Cowdell- Yes, Fairbanks- Yes, Saville- Yes

**MOTION PASSED**



6 in favor, 1 absent

8. Interlocal Agreement: Salt Lake County/Sandy Hazardous Waste Collection Center  
Resolution #06-55 C - authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake County and Sandy City for the operation of a small hazardous waste collection center at Sandy Public Works Facility on 700 West.

MOTION: Chris McCandless made the motion to adopt Resolution #06-55 C - authorizing the execution of an Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake County and Sandy City for the operation of a small hazardous waste collection center at Sandy Public Works Facility on 700 West.

SECOND: Bryant Anderson

VOTE: McCandless- Yes, Anderson- Yes, Tenney- Yes, Smith- Absent,  
Cowdell- Yes, Fairbanks- Yes, Saville- Yes

MOTION PASSED

6 in favor, 1 absent

9. MAYOR'S REPORT:

- a. Mayor Dolan reported that he really enjoyed his recent vacation to Yellowstone. He said he caught two fish and did a lot of sleeping.

10. CAO'S REPORT:

- a. None

11. COUNCIL OFFICE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- a. Phil Glenn reminded the Council of their meeting next week with the Board of the Alta Canyon Recreation Special Service District. The discussion will be in regard to the Truth in Taxation Hearing to be held on August 8<sup>th</sup>. This discussion should take about 45 minutes and then the Council will go on a tour of Community Development projects.

12. OTHER COUNCIL BUSINESS:

- a. Bryant Anderson stated that he would like to encourage the City Council to talk to the County City Council about the soccer stadium. He reported that he had spoken with Mayor Corroon's Staff and they advised him why the County's Mayor did not vote for the stadium. Basically, it boiled down to security and return on the money invested. Mr. Anderson said he passed this information onto Randy Sant so that he could use it in his discussion.
- b. Bryant Anderson reported that the weekly attendance at the new aquarium appears to be quite high. They have told him, on average, they have 800 visitors per day. This is the level of attendance that they were experiencing at the Gateway on weekends.

At approximately 8:00 p.m., Scott Cowdell made a motion to adjourn Council Meeting, motion seconded by Chris McCandless.

The content of the minutes is not intended, nor are they submitted, as a verbatim transcription of the meeting. These minutes are a brief overview of what occurred at the meeting.

**Council Chairman**

**Council Office Manager**

**xm071806.min**